

Guide," IEEE Colloq. 1990, No. 101, pages 1 - 15 ("Sanderson"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Examiner asserts that Sanderson teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1, including a user controlled client establishing communication with a server over a communication channel, a client identifying a user-defined profile to the server, the first application program examining a database of the information automatically retrieving a subset of information, and first application program transmitting the subset of information from the database to server and presenting it to the client. However, Examiner admits that Sanderson fails to teach a server engaging a first application program, such first application program retrieving a user-defined profile. The Examiner then takes official notice that this step is equivalent to the server engaging as shown in figures 3 - 5 on pages 3 - 4 of Sanderson.

Even if Sanderson did teach the steps as the Examiner asserts, Applicant respectfully submits that it neither teaches nor suggests that the first application program is engaged by the server and retrieves the user-defined profile. The Applicant respectfully submits that figures 3 - 5 and the corresponding text merely show the creation of a search on a client system, not engagement of an application in the server, nor retrieval of a user-defined profile. Applicant is, therefore, at a loss to see how the Examiner can take official notice that this creation of a search on client system is the same as "the server engaging a first application program, the first application program retrieving the user-defined profile" as claimed by Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that this step is neither taught nor suggested by the references cited by the Examiner and, therefore, all claims now pending are allowable.

Examiner further rejects claims 2 - 5, 7 - 14, 16 - 23, and 25 - 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sanderson, in further view of Vetter, "Mosaic and

the World-Wide Web," Computer Magazine, October, 1994, vol. 27, issue 10, pages 49 - 57 ("Vetter"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In addition to the deficiency noted above, with respect to the dependent claims, the Examiner has not identified any teachings or suggestions within the cited references of several claimed features. Moreover, Applicant has been unable to locate any such teaching or suggestion within the references. Several of these features are set forth below.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in either of these cited references of communication between the server application program and the first application program by a common gateway interface as claimed in dependent claim 3. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of storing the user-defined profile in the second computer system to retain the state of said user profile as claimed in dependent claim 4. There is also no teaching or suggestion of retrieving the subset of information from the database based upon user-defined profile being performed at "periodic intervals irrespective of said client establishing communications with said server" as claimed in dependent claim 5. Applicant therefore submits that each of these dependent claims are independently patentable over the references of record. Similar limitations are claimed in dependent claims 8 and 9 which are, therefore, also independently patentable.

As claim 10, there is no teaching or suggestion in either cited reference of a first application program retrieving source identifications and associated search terms, nor is there any teaching or suggestion of scanning for sources in the database as claimed in dependent claim 10. Sanderson contains no teaching or suggestion of such identification because it is specific to the financial times. There is no need to designate source as only one source is available. Accordingly, Sanderson cannot teach or suggest such source identification as part of the user-defined profile.

Dependent claim 10 is therefore independently patentable. Analogous reasoning applies to claims 25 - 26.

There is no teaching or suggestion as claimed in dependent claims 11 and 13 that source identifications and associated search terms from the user-defined profile are sorted by topic. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion as claimed in dependent claim 14 that the application program presenting the subset organizes the subset by topics. Therefore, claims 11, 13, and 14 are all independently patentable. An analogous discussion applies to claims 16 - 23.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1 - 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: 6/11, 1996



Thomas M. Coester
Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on 6/12/96



Carla Meshach

6/12/96
Date